



ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.: 049128-5123

Application No.: 10/606,800

Page 2

## **REMARKS**

### **Summary of the Office Action**

Claims 1, 2, 4, 8, 9, and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Crosby (US 4,357,061) in view of Ernstoff et al. (US 4,006,968).

Claims 3, 5-7, 10, and 12-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Crosby in view of Ernstoff et al. and Lee (US 6,105,215).

### **Summary of the Response to the Office Action**

Applicants have amended independent claims 1 and 8 to further define the invention. Accordingly, claims 1-14 are pending for consideration.

### **All Claims Define Allowable Subject Matter**

Claims 1, 2, 4, 8, 9, and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Crosby (US 4,357,061) in view of Ernstoff et al. (US 4,006,968), and claims 3, 5-7, 10, and 12-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Crosby in view of Ernstoff et al. and Lee (US 6,105,215). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections as being based upon combinations of references that neither teach nor suggest the novel combination of features recited in independent claims 1 and 8, and hence dependent claims 2-7 and 9-14.

Independent claim 1, as amended, recites a liquid crystal display device including, in part, “at least one hole formed through a thickness of the printed circuit board” wherein “the projected part is inserted into the hole to affix the printed circuit board to the supporter main and *the projected part has a projecting length less than the thickness of the printed circuit board*”

(emphasis added). Similarly, independent claim 8, as amended, recites a method of fabricating a

liquid crystal display device including, in part, a step of “providing a printed circuit board having a drive circuit mounted thereon to drive the liquid crystal display panel and at least one hole formed through a thickness of the printed circuit board” wherein “*a projecting length of the projected part is less than the thickness of the printed circuit board*” (emphasis added).

In contrast to Applicants’ claimed invention, Crosby explicitly teaches posts 34 that pass completely through the holes 96 of the PC board 16 in order for prongs 86 to engage openings 92 of clip member 38. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that Crosby fails to teach or suggest a liquid crystal display device including, in part, “at least one hole formed through a thickness of the printed circuit board” wherein “the projected part is inserted into the hole to affix the printed circuit board to the supporter main and the projected part has a projecting length less than the thickness of the printed circuit board,” as recited by amended independent claim 1.

Likewise, Applicants respectfully assert that Crosby fails to teach or suggest a method of fabricating a liquid crystal display device including, in part, a step of “providing a printed circuit board having a drive circuit mounted thereon to drive the liquid crystal display panel and at least one hole formed through a thickness of the printed circuit board” wherein “a projecting length of the projected part is less than the thickness of the printed circuit board,” as recited by amended independent claim 8.

In addition, Applicants further assert that Ernstoff et al. and Lee, whether taken singly or combined, can remedy the deficiencies of Crosby, as detailed above. Specifically, Applicants respectfully assert that Ernstoff et al. and Lee, whether taken singly or combined, teach or suggest any features recited by amended independent claims 1 and 8.

For the above reasons, Applicants respectfully assert that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) should be withdrawn because Crosby, Ernststoff et al., and Lee, whether taken individually or in combination, neither teach nor suggest the novel combination of features clearly recited by amended independent claims 1 and 8, and hence dependent claims 2-7 and 9-14.

### **CONCLUSION**


In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and the timely allowance of the pending claims. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of the response, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicants' undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 not accounted for above, such an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

**MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP**

By: \_\_\_\_\_

  
David B. Hardy  
Reg. No. 47,362

Dated: September 14, 2005

**CUSTOMER NO. 09629**  
**MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP**  
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20004  
Telephone: (202) 739-3000